

# Identifying Chemical and Biological Hazards in Washington State's Workplaces: A survey of labor groups, business associations, and health & safety professionals

Technical Report Number 69-2-2003

This report was prepared by Stephen G. Whittaker, Ph.D., Toxicologist.

Suggested citation for this report:

Whittaker, SG: Identifying Chemical and Biological Hazards in Washington State's Workplaces: A survey of labor groups, business associations, and health & safety professionals. Technical report 69-2-2003. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.

March 2003

# **Table of Contents**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IV
LIST OF DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VII
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	3
IDENTIFICATION OF SURVEY RECIPIENTS	2
SURVEY STRATEGY	
SURVEY INSTRUMENT	
DATA ENTRY, CODING, AND ANALYSIS	
RESULTS	7
SURVEY RESPONSE RATE	7
RESPONDENT OCCUPATION	
CORRECTION AND MODIFICATION OF RESPONSES	
HAZARDS IDENTIFIED	
Silica	
Paints	
Isocyanates	
Carbon monoxide	
Molds	
Asphalt	
Bodily Fluids	
Solvents	
Asbestos	
INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRINCIPAL HAZARDS	
DISCUSSION	45
REFERENCES	47
APPENDIX A: CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL HAZARDS SURVEY	49
APPENDIX B: HAZARDS IDENTIFIED	
TABLES	_
Table 1. Number of Surveys Distributed	
Table 2. Number of Respondents by Self-Reported Occupation	
Table 3. Most Frequently Mentioned Hazards	
Table 5. Survey Responses for Paints	
Table 6. Survey Responses for Isocyanates	
Table 7. Survey Responses for Welding Fumes	
Table 8. Survey Responses for Carbon monoxide	
Table 9. Survey Responses for Molds	
Table 10. Survey Responses for Asphalt	32
Table 11. Survey Responses for Bodily Fluids	
Table 12. Survey Responses for Solvents	
Table 13. Survey Responses for Asbestos	
Table 14. Industries Associated with the Principal Hazards	43

## **Acknowledgments**

The contributions, review, and comments of the following L&I staff are gratefully acknowledged:

David Bonauto, MD, MPH, Associate Medical Director, SHARP Program

Marty Cohen, ScD, CIH, Senior Industrial Hygienist, SHARP Program

W Marc Leastman, Information Technology Support, SHARP Program

Don J. Lofgren, Industrial Hygiene Compliance Supervisor, WISHA Services

Hieu Pham, Office Assistant, SHARP Program

Carolyn Reeb Whitaker, MS, Industrial Hygienist, SHARP Program

Barbara Silverstein, PhD, MPH, CPE, Research Director, SHARP Program

The following individuals provided invaluable input to the survey's design:

James Boiano, MS, CIH and Gregory Piacitelli, MS, CIH, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)

Chuck Bailey, Building Trades Labor-Management Organization of Washington

Randall Bentley, The Boeing Company

Buck Cameron, United Brotherhood of Carpenters

Mary Ellen Flanagan, MS, CIH, Field Consultation and Research Group, University of Washington

Scott Parker, MS, Argus Pacific, Inc

The following individuals provided access to the electronic membership directories of their respective organizations:

Randy Loomans, Washington State Labor Council (WSLC), AFL-CIO

Darrell Tsujii, CIH and Jeanette U, Pacific Northwest Section of the American Industrial Hygiene Association (PNS-AIHA)

Vicky Yobp, American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA)

# List of Definitions and Acronyms

ACGIHAn	nerican Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists
AIHAAn	merican Industrial Hygiene Association
ANSIAn	merican National Standards Institute
BLSU.S	S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics
CFOICe	ensus of Fatal Occupational Injuries
DOHWa	ashington State Department of Health
DOLU.S	S. Department of Labor
IHInd	lustrial Hygienist
L&IWa	ashington State Department of Labor and Industries
NIOSHNa	ational Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
NOESNa	ational Occupational Exposure Survey
OIICSOc	ecupational Injury/Illness Coding System
OSHAOc	ecupational Safety and Health Administration
PNS-AIHAPac	cific Northwest Section of the American Industrial Hygiene Association
PPEPer	rsonal Protective Equipment
SHARPSaf	fety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention
SICSta	andard Industrial Classification
WACWa	ashington Administrative Code
WCRSWo	orkplace Chemical Ranking System
WISHAWa	ashington Industrial Safety and Health Act – Washington's state OSHA program
WSLCWa	ashington State Labor Council

# **Executive Summary**

The aim of this study was to identify the principal chemical and biological hazards in Washington's workplaces. To this end, the Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention (SHARP) Program developed and distributed a survey instrument to a total of 1880 health & safety professionals, labor organizations, and business associations across Washington State.

The principal hazards identified by survey respondents were: silica, paints, isocyanates, welding fumes, carbon monoxide, molds, asphalt, bodily fluids, solvents, and asbestos. Construction was the most frequently mentioned industry. Although the harmful effects of many of these hazards have been recognized for decades, there is a critical need for health & safety professionals to address these exposures, including the development of effective exposure controls that do not rely on workers' use of personal protective equipment.

The low response rate to the survey (4 percent) means that the information gathered cannot be regarded as representative. However, these data are a useful first-step towards identifying hazards of concern in Washington's workplaces and setting occupational health research, education, and outreach priorities in Washington State.

Readers interested in discussing the hazards identified in this study are encouraged to contact the SHARP Program at 1-888-66-SHARP.

# Introduction

Washington State's workplaces contain numerous chemical and biological hazards that have the potential to cause adverse health effects, like cancer, asthma, and skin problems. However, targeting prevention efforts to address chemical and biological exposures is a complex process, because attributing work-related illness to workplace exposures is fraught with difficulties.

The Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention (SHARP) Program administers several occupational disease and injury surveillance systems that have proven extremely useful for targeting occupational injury and illness prevention activities. Several of SHARP's systems rely, at least in part, on Washington State's Workers' Compensation data. These systems include those designed to track work-related musculoskeletal disorders (Silverstein & Kalat 2002), workplace violence (Foley 2002), traumatic head and brain injuries (Cohen et al. 1999), dermatitis (Sama et al. 1998), occupational asthma (Baggs et al. 2000; DOH 2002a), and hospitalized burns (Baggs et al. 2000, 2002). The Fatality Assessment and Control Evaluation (FACE) program collects work-related traumatic fatality data from the Department of Labor & Industries' (L&I's) Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) group, the Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA) Program, the Washington State Department of Health, public safety officials, newspapers, medical examiners/coroners, and other sources (DOH 2002b). In addition, blood lead level data for Washington State's Occupational Lead Exposure Registry originates from reports submitted by blood lead testing laboratories (Whittaker & Curwick 2001).

Although there has been substantial progress in the development of occupational disease and injury surveillance methods, systems for hazard surveillance are much less well developed. Hazard surveillance could serve as the basis for the primary prevention of work-related morbidity and mortality because it is directed at earlier recognition of risks than are systems that record injuries and illnesses once they have occurred (NIOSH 1996a). The SHARP Program has evaluated several hazard surveillance systems in an attempt to identify the principal workplace chemical exposures of concern in Washington State (Drozdowsky 2000). SHARP developed a Workplace Chemical Ranking System (WCRS), which combined exposure data from the National Occupational Exposure Survey (NOES) (NIOSH 1988, 1989a, 1989b) with Washington State employment statistics, and chemical toxicity data to yield relative risks associated with specific workplace chemicals (Drozdowsky 2000). However, the usefulness of the WCRS proved to be limited by uncertainties associated with the NOES database (Drozdowsky 2000; Greife et al. 1995) and enumerating exposed workers in Washington workplaces, in addition to the lack of toxicity data for numerous workplace chemicals. It should be noted that the difficulties associated with

identifying and quantifying potential chemical exposures were not unique to the WCRS; they are common to many hazard surveillance systems.

In order to avoid the limitations inherent in many hazard surveillance systems, SHARP developed a "Chemical and Biological Hazards Survey" to help identify the most serious chemical and biological hazards in Washington workplaces and the workers who are exposed to them. The survey was distributed to three principal stakeholder groups in Washington State: Labor Organizations, Business Associations, and Health & Safety Professionals. The results of this survey will be used to help set occupational health research, education, and outreach priorities in Washington State.

# Methods

# **Identification of Survey Recipients**

Five sources of information were used to generate a "master mailing list". These data sources were accessed in September of 2001. Where appropriate, permission to use membership rosters was requested from the administrators of the following databases:

- 1. The membership directory for the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA).
- 2. The membership roster of the Pacific Northwest Section of the American Industrial Hygiene Association (PNS-AIHA).
- 3. The online membership directory for the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH).
- 4. The directory of labor unions affiliated with the Washington State Labor Council (WSLC).
- 5. The Public Affairs Stakeholder List administered by L&I. This Microsoft Access<sup>TM</sup> database contains contact information for business associations. Organizations judged to be relevant to the survey were selected for inclusion.

Organization members with Washington State mailing addresses were included. Data from these five sources were combined in a custom Microsoft Access<sup>TM</sup> database and duplicate records were eliminated to generate the master mailing list.

The survey was also distributed via e-mail using the distribution list for Industrial Hygienists (IHs) associated with L&I's WISHA Services. In addition, the survey and instructions were posted on SHARP's web site at <a href="https://www.lni.wa.gov/sharp/hazchem">www.lni.wa.gov/sharp/hazchem</a>.

# **Survey Strategy**

The survey package (Appendix A) was distributed to Labor Groups and Health & Safety Professionals in October 2001. The package for Business Associations was mailed in January 2002. The following items were included in the package:

- A cover letter describing the purpose of the survey. The letter was customized for the three stakeholder groups – Labor Organizations, Business Associations, and Health & Safety Professionals;
- An example of a completed survey;

- The survey instrument; and
- A postage-paid return envelope (for mailed surveys).

Recipients were provided a deadline of three weeks to complete and return the survey. Four weeks after the initial distribution (i.e., one week after the specified deadline expired), either a reminder postcard was mailed or an e-mail was sent, as appropriate.

#### **Survey Instrument**

Recipients (or their representatives) were asked to select from a list of occupations that best described their position. Although recipients were provided the opportunity to return their mail surveys anonymously, they were encouraged to provide contact information in order to further discuss their selection(s) or receive a copy of the results. Recipients were assured that their name and affiliation would not be shared with anyone outside of the SHARP Program.

Survey recipients were asked to describe up to three chemical or biological hazards (ranked in order of concern) that they believed to be the most significant problems in Washington workplaces. "Chemical hazards" were defined as any form (solid, liquid, or gas) of a hazardous chemical substance (including dusts, vapors, mists, fumes, etc.). "Biological hazards" were defined as animal tissues (e.g., meats), bodily fluids (like blood, urine, or feces), bacteria, viruses, molds, or fungi.

For each hazard identified, recipients were asked to provide the following information:

- The physical form of the hazard;
- The industry/business where exposure occurs;
- The job titles of the exposed workers and the tasks they perform;
- Why the hazard is of concern (ranked); and
- Actions required to reduce or eliminate exposures (ranked).

The recipients were also encouraged to provide open-ended comments.

#### Data Entry, Coding, and Analysis

Survey data were key-entered into a custom Microsoft Access TM database.

The hazards reported by respondents were categorized according to the Source of Injury/Illness from the Occupational Injury/Illness Coding System (OIICS). This classification system was developed by the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL's) Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and is used to code the case characteristics of injuries and illnesses by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries (CFOI) program.

Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes (1987 revision) were applied to the industries/businesses specified by respondents. SIC codes are four-digit numbers used by the Bureau of Census to categorize business activities conducted in the United States. The first two digits of the code represent the major industry group and the second two digits represent the specific subset of that group.

Descriptive analyses were performed by querying the Microsoft Access<sup>TM</sup> database and exporting data to Microsoft Excel<sup>TM</sup>.

# **Results**

#### **Survey Response Rate**

The number of surveys distributed by stakeholder group is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of Surveys Distributed					
Stakeholder Group	Number of Surveys				
Labor Groups (mailed) <sup>a</sup>	815				
Health & Safety Professionals (mailed) <sup>b</sup>	736				
WISHA Industrial Hygienists (e-mailed) <sup>c</sup>	80				
Business Associations (mailed) <sup>d</sup>	249				
TOTAL 1880					
<sup>a</sup> From WSLC affiliates mailing list					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>From AIHA, PNS-AIHA, and ACGIH membership lists

Completed surveys were received from 75 of the 1880 individuals or organizations to whom the survey was distributed, yielding a crude response rate of 4 percent. It was not possible to stratify the response rate by stakeholder group (identified from the master mailing list) because 21 percent of respondents (16 individuals) provided anonymous survey responses and could not be matched to the source of mailing information. However, responses by self-identified occupation are described below.

## **Respondent Occupation**

The number of surveys returned by self-reported respondent occupation is presented in Table 2. The greatest number of surveys was returned by Labor Representatives (37.3 percent), followed by Government Agency Health & Safety Professionals (20.0 percent), Workers (12.0 percent), and IH Consultants (10.7 percent). These four occupations combined represented 80 percent of the total surveys returned.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>From WISHA's e-mail distribution list

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>From L&I's Public Affairs Stakeholder List

Table 2. Number of Respondents by Self-Reported Occupation					
Occupation	Number of Respondents (%)				
Academic IH or researcher	2 (2.7%)				
Corporate health & safety professional	3 (4.0%)				
Employer	1 (1.3%)				
Government agency health & safety professional	15 (20.0%)				
IH Consultant (private company)	8 (10.7%)				
Labor representative	28 (37.3%)				
Plant or facility health & safety professional	1 (1.3%)				
Worker	9 (12.0%)				
Other	6 (8.0%)				
Occupation not provided	2 (2.7%)				
TOTAL	75				

#### **Correction and Modification of Responses**

When specifying the physical form of the hazard, respondents occasionally selected forms that were not appropriate for their hazard. For example, when describing paints, several respondents selected "fumes" as a physical form. In these cases, the respondents' selections were recorded in the database, but a question mark (?) was added to denote a questionable response.

Any references to specific individuals, employers, or workplaces were removed during preparation of summary tables.

Occasionally, respondents failed to rank their responses to the questions "Why the hazard is of concern?" and "Actions required to reduce or eliminate exposures?" Respondents occasionally provided a check mark, rather than placing numerical values next to their selections. In these cases, every checked option was ranked as their highest priority. Other errors introduced by respondents when ranking their responses were corrected prior to data entry.

#### **Hazards Identified**

The hazards identified by the survey respondents are presented in Appendix B. A total of 84 different hazards were identified; several were mentioned by multiple respondents (the 84 hazards were mentioned a total of 147 times). The hazards fell into 18 OIICS Source categories; those containing 10 or more "hazard mentions" were:

- 1. Other Chemicals (28 hazard mentions);
- 2. Chemical Products General (27 hazard mentions);
- 3. Non Metallic Minerals, Except Fuel (18 hazard mentions);
- 4. Infectious and Parasitic Agents (14 hazard mentions);
- 5. Metallic Particulates, Trace Elements, Dusts, Powders, Fumes (12 hazard mentions); and
- 6. Chemicals and Chemical Products, Unspecified (10 hazard mentions).

The ten most frequently mentioned hazards are summarized in Table 3. The remaining discussion will focus on these ten hazards, which were mentioned a total of 60 times.

Table 3. Most Frequently Mentioned Hazards							
	Num	ber of Mention	ıs as:				
Hazard	Hazard Rank #1	Hazard Rank #2	Hazard Rank #3	Total Mentions			
Silica (including abrasive blasting, silica dusts, and "fibrous siliceous dusts")	8	3	1	12			
Paints (including "fumes" and coatings)	4	2	1	7			
Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethanes)		2	5	7			
Welding fumes	4	2		6			
Carbon monoxide (including vehicle exhaust and exhaust gases)	4		1	5			
Molds	2	3		5			
Asphalt (including fumes)	2	3		5			
Bodily fluids	4	1		5			
Solvents	3		1	4			
Asbestos	3	1		4			

#### Silica

Silica (including abrasive blasting, silica dusts, and "fibrous siliceous dusts") was mentioned 12 times, and was the highest ranked hazard for eight respondents (see Table 4). Exposure to silica dust was reported to be a hazard primarily for construction workers who sandblast, cut, drill, and sweep silicacontaining materials.

The top concern associated with silica was the "potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit" (the highest-ranked concern for seven respondents), followed by "large number of exposed workers" (the highest-ranked concern for five respondents). The top actions suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure were "education and training of employers", "personal protective equipment", and "engineering controls" (considered the highest-ranked actions by four respondents).

#### **Paints**

Paints were mentioned seven times, and were the highest ranked hazard for four respondents (see Table 5). Workers who mix, apply, and cleanup paints were mentioned most frequently, although welders, production workers, machine operators, driver/forklift operators, and other workers were also mentioned.

The top concern associated with paints was the "potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit" (the highest-ranked concern for all seven respondents). The top actions suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure were "education and training of employers" and "personal protective equipment" (the highest-ranked actions for two respondents).

Table 4.	Survey	Responses	for	Silica
Table 4.	Survey	Responses	for	Silica

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Labor representative	1	Dust	Construction	Laborers	<ul><li>Chipping, grinding, breaking</li><li>Dry sack and patching</li><li>Shoveling</li></ul>	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Large number of exposed workers     Health effects described in the literature	<ol> <li>Engineering Controls</li> <li>Personal Protective Equipment</li> <li>Enforcement of regulations</li> </ol>
Government agency health & safety professional	1	Dust	Construction/Fixed industry/Agriculture	Masons Sandblasters Concrete finishers	Tuck pointing - masonry restoration  Cutting brick/block dry  Blasting concrete with silica sand  Blasting other substrate with silica sand  Sanding/patching concrete (Dry grinding)	1. Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit 2. Health effects described in the literature 3. Lack of commercially available us eful engineering controls	Personal Protective Equipment     Engineering Controls     Education and training of employers
Corporate health & safety professional	1	Dust	Hard rock mining	Underground miners  Processing technicians	<ul> <li>Operating drilling machine</li> <li>Operating loader</li> <li>Clean-up</li> <li>Checking equipment</li> </ul>	Large number of exposed workers     Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Illness/symptoms observed in workers	Engineering Controls     Personal Protective Equipment     Administrative Controls

Table 4. Survey Responses for Silica

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Government agency health & safety professional	1	Dust	Construction, masonry, restoration retrofitting, earthquake retrofitting, brick work (concrete, bricks, & mortar)	Hod carriers	Installs new mortar     May cut out mistakes when mortar dries, sweep dust	Potential for     exceeding     workplace exposure     limit	Education and training of workers     Education and training of employers
				Masonry retrofitters	<ul><li>Cuts brick</li><li>Sweeps dust</li></ul>	Large number of exposed workers     Health effects	3. Engineering Controls
				General contractors	In area of retrofitting	described in the literature	
IH Consultant (private company)	1	Dust	Construction/ demolition	Demolition workers	Demolition of building materials	Potential for     exceeding     workplace exposure	Enforcement of workplace regulations
company)				Supervisors	Supervision of demolition workers	2. Large number of exposed workers 3. Health effects described in the literature	Education and training of employers
				Other trades	Present during demolition		Personal Protective     Equipment     Engineering Controls
Labor representative	1	Dust	Mechanical application repair insulation stripping etc. commercial, industrial, marine ("Fibrous siliceous dusts")	Insulators	<ul> <li>Application of insulation materials</li> <li>Reworking insulation during repair</li> <li>Insulation removal for demo or remodel</li> </ul>	Large number of exposed workers     Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Health effects	<ol> <li>Personal Protective Equipment</li> <li>Education and training of employers</li> <li>Engineering Controls</li> </ol>
				Insulator helpers	<ul><li>Jobsite cleanup-sweeping</li><li>Jobsite cleanup-boxing</li><li>Material distribution</li></ul>	described in the literature	

**Table 4. Survey Responses for Silica** Industry/Business Job Title of **Physical** Respondent Hazard Exposed Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Form of where Exposure Occupation Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Rank Hazard **Occurs (Comments)** 1. Large number of 1 Dust Construction/ 1. Education and Worker Journeyman Exposure to dust of maintenance electricians exposed workers training of employers concrete worker 2. Exposure can be all 2. Engineering Controls • Drilling into concrete over the job for 3. Administrative Demolition and concrete hours or days Controls removal 3. Potential for exceeding Apprentice Exposure to dust of electricians workplace exposure concrete worker limit Drill into concrete Demolition and concrete removal Exposure to dust of Foreman electricians concrete worker Drill into concrete Demolition and concrete removal

Table 4. Survey Responses for Silica

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Government agency health & safety professional	1	Dust	Construction	Various	Not specified	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Large number of exposed workers     Illness/symptoms observed in workers     Health effects described in the literature     Lack of available exposure or health information	Education and training of employers     Engineering Controls     Education and training of workers     Enforcement of workplace regulations     Medical surveillance     Personal Protective Equipment     Administrative Controls
Government agency health & safety professional	2	Dust	Construction/ highway contract work/painting activities (Respirable crystalline quartz)	Highway contractors  Sandblasters  Rock polishers (concrete fab. products)	Use of compressed air for cleaning radial pavement cuts     Not specified     Not specified	1. Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit  1. Illness/symptoms observed in workers  1. Health effects described in the literature	<ol> <li>Development of a silica standard</li> <li>Education and training of employers</li> <li>Education and training of workers</li> <li>Enforcement of workplace regulations</li> <li>Medical surveillance</li> <li>Personal Protective Equipment</li> <li>Engineering Controls</li> </ol>

Table 4. Survey Responses for Silica **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Respondent Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 2 Solid?. Abrasive blasting Sandblasters 1. Potential for 1. Personal Protective Labor Preparing equipment for Dust exceeding Equipment representative workplace exposure 2. Education and Blasting of surfaces limit training of workers · Monitoring and cleanup of 2. Lack of available 3. Education and blast exposure or health training of employers information 3. Large number of exposed workers 2 Labor Dust Mine site construction Rodman 1. Health effects 1. Education and · Reinforcing steel assembly representative described in the training of workers Cutting/burning steel literature 2. Personal Protective 2. Potential for Equipment exceeding 3. Education and workplace exposure training of employers limit 3. Large number of exposed workers Labor 3 Dust Apparatus repair Electricians 1. Large number of 1. Education and Not specified (Grinding/sanding exposed workers representative training of employers taking place where all Machinists Not specified 2. Lack of available 2. Education and employees are exposure or health training of workers affected. Dusts contain Mechanics Not specified information various insulations 3. Personal Protective (mica, micarta, silica) 3. Potential for Equipment

exceeding

limit

workplace exposure

Table 5. Survey Responses for Paints

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Labor representative	1	Fume?	Construction (Paint fumes)	All crafts	Construction	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Large number of exposed workers     Lack of available exposure or health information	Engineering Controls     Administrative     Controls     Personal Protective     Equipment
Worker	1	Liquid Vapor Fume? Mist	Hydro projects – dams (paint and solvents)	Painter  Hydro- mechanics	<ul> <li>Mixing paints</li> <li>Spraying or applying paints</li> <li>Clean up of equipment</li> <li>Mixing paints</li> <li>Spraying or applying paints</li> <li>Clean up of equipment</li> </ul>	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Health effects described in the literature     Large number of exposed workers	Education and training of workers     Education and training of employers     Enforcement of workplace regulations
Labor representative	1	Dust Vapor Fume? Mist	Metal fabrication (Industrial paints, coatings, and preservatives for bridge girders and large fab production.)	Welders  Production workers  Machine operators	<ul> <li>Welding and fitting metal parts</li> <li>Grinding</li> <li>Forklift</li> <li>Crane operation</li> <li>Sawing</li> <li>Cutting</li> <li>Forming</li> </ul>	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Health effects described in the literature     Lack of available exposure or health information     Large number of exposed workers	Education and training of employers     Medical surveillance     Education and training of workers

Table 5. Survey Responses for Paints

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Labor representative	1	Liquid Vapor Fume?	Industrial & commercial painting (Solvent-based paint coatings)	Coating applicator  Apprentice painter	Mixing products     Application of products     Cleanup of product and equipment      Mask and prepare for application     Tend to equipment     Cleanup of equipment	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Large number of exposed workers     Illness/symptoms observed in workers	Education and training of employers     Education and training of workers     Personal Protective Equipment
IH Consultant (private company)	2	Solid Vapor Mist	Aerospace. Trucks, Auto repair (Painting with chromates and isocyanates)	Painters	Not specified	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Need new limits and sampling & analysis     Lack of available exposure or health information	Enforcement of workplace regulations     Education and training of employers     Medical surveillance
Labor representative	2	Solid Dust Liquid Vapor Fume? Mist Gas?	Ship repair	Driver/ Forklift operator	Delivery of paint and chemicals	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Lack of available exposure or health information     Health effects described in the literature	Personal Protective Equipment     Administrative Controls     Education and training of employers

**Table 5. Survey Responses for Paints** Industry/Business Job Title of **Physical** Tasks Performed by **Top Actions** Respondent Hazard Form of where Exposure **Exposed** Top Reasons for Occupation Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Rank Occurs (Comments) 3 Vehicle fabrication/repair Government Liquid Painter 1. Potential for 1. Personal Protective Apply coatings agency health & Vapor (Vehicle painting and exceeding Equipment Mix coatings workplace exposure safety Mist coating) 2. Engineering Controls professional limit Clean equipment 3. Education and 2. Lack of available training of workers Vehicle Apply coatings exposure or health maintenance information Clean equipment 3. Health effects Supervisor Inspect vehicles described in the literature

#### *Isocyanates*

Isocyanates were mentioned seven times, and were the second-highest ranked hazard for two respondents and the third-highest ranked for five respondents (see Table 6). Workers who mix, apply, and cleanup isocyanate-containing products were identified as being at risk for isocyanate exposure. However, isocyanates were also mentioned by a respondent who expressed concerned about paints (see the fifth entry in Table 5).

The top concern associated with isocyanates was "health effects described in the literature" (the highest-ranked concern for four respondents), followed by "illness/symptoms observed in workers" and "potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit" (both considered the highest-ranked concern for three respondents). The top actions suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure were "engineering controls" (the highest-ranked action for four respondents), followed by "education and training of employers" and "personal protective equipment" (both considered the highest-ranked action for three respondents).

#### Welding Fumes

Welding fumes were mentioned six times, and were the highest ranked hazard for four respondents (see Table 7). Workers identified specifically as welders were of primary concern; welding was identified as taking place while repairing boilers, fabricating and repairing vehicles, during construction, and maintaining equipment and machinery.

The top concern associated with welding fumes was the "potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit" (the highest-ranked concern for four respondents). The top actions suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure were "education and training of employers" and "personal protective equipment" (both considered the highest-ranked actions for three respondents).

Table 6. Survey Responses for Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethane) **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Respondent Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of where Exposure **Exposed** Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 2 Government Vapor Autobody repair Painter 1. Illness/symptoms 1. Engineering controls Spray painter agency health & observed in 2. Personal Protective safety workers Equipment professional 2. Large number of 3. Education and exposed workers training of employers 3. Health effects described in the literature Labor 2 Vapor Roofing (Polyisocyanate Roofer 1. Potential for 1. Education and Washing rubber roofing representative Mist liquid) surfaces exceeding training of employers workplace exposure 2. Education and · Opening can limit training of workers · Storing cans 2. Health effects 3. Medical surveillance described in the literature 3. Large number of exposed workers Government Vapor Not specified Auto painting 1. Health effects 1. Personal Protective Spray finishing agency health & Mist truck described in the Equipment literature safety 2. Education and Metal parts Spray finishing professional 2. Illness/symptoms training of workers painting observed in Mixing 3. Education and workers training of employers Spray foam Spray foam applicator-fixed 3. Large number of insulating site exposed workers Spray foam applicatorconstruction Insulation installation

Table 6. Survey Responses for Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethane) Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent **Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 3 Solid Not specified (Catalyzed Production 1. Potential for 1. Education and Labor Mixing materials representative Dust materials - lacquers, workers exceeding training of employers Applying coatings Liauid epoxies, and urethanes) workplace exposure 1. Education and Vapor limit training of workers Painters Mixing materials Fume? 1. Illness/symptoms Mist 1. Medical surveillance Spraying coatings observed in workers 1. Personal Protective Equipment 1. Health effects described in the literature 1. Lack of available exposure or health information 1. Large number of exposed workers Government Vapor Autobody shops Paint spray Auto vehicle 1. Illness/symptoms 1. Education and agency health & finisher observed in training of employers Mist (Solvents/Isocyanates) safety workers 1. Education and professional 1. Health effects training of workers described in the 1. Enforcement of literature workplace 1. Large number of regulations exposed workers 1. Medical surveillance 1. Personal Protective Equipment 1. Engineering Controls

Table 6. Survey Responses for Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethane) Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent **Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 3 IH Consultant Liquid Aircraft manufacturing/ Spray · Mixing polyurethane paints 1. Health effects 1. Engineering Controls Vapor autobody repair (TDI & (private painter described in the 2. Personal Protective Spraying polyurethane paint company) Mist MDI) literature Equipment · Cleaning spraying and 2. Potential for 3. Enforcement of mixing equip. exceeding workplace workplace exposure regulations Foam Mixing polyurethane resin limit insulation with catalyst 3. Large number of installer Applying foam insulation exposed workers Cleaning foam mixing equipment QA/Safety 3 1. Potential for Liquid Boat manufacturing All workers 1. Engineering Controls Not specified Officer (Toluene di isocyanate exceeding 2. Education and TDI) workplace exposure training of workers limit 3. Enforcement of 2. Illness/symptoms workplace observed in regulations workers 3. Health effects described in the literature

Table 7. Survey Responses for Welding Fumes **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Respondent Hazard **Exposed Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Form of where Exposure **Exposed Workers** Necessary (Ranked) Occupation Rank Hazard Workers Concern (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** Vapor Not specified 1 Boiler repair Boilermaker • Welding Steel Galvanized 1. Potential for 1. Education and Fume training of employers exceeding Gas workplace exposure 1. Enforcement of limit workplace 1. Illness/symptoms regulations observed in 1. Medical surveillance workers 1. Personal Protective 1. Health effects Equipment described in the literature Government Fume Vehicle fabrication/repair Welder • Welding-large scale, all 1. Potential for 1. Engineering Controls agency health & types exceeding 2. Education and safety workplace exposure training of workers Acetylene torch cutting professional limit 3. Education and Vehicle 2. Illness/symptoms Small scale welding training of employers maintenance observed in workers 3. Health effects described in the literature

Table 7. Survey Responses for Welding Fumes **Physical Industry/Business** Job Title of Respondent **Exposed Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Hazard Form of where Exposure Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** Fume Welder IH Consultant 1 Construction 1. Potential for 1. Education and Welding pipe (private exceeding training of employers Torch cutting metal company) workplace exposure 2. Education and limit Welding steel plate training of workers 2. Health effects 3. Engineering Controls Steel worker Welding structural steel described in the literature Torch cutting steel 3. Large number of Torch cutting painted exposed workers surface Demolition • Torch cutting structural steel worker Torch cutting painted surface 1 Fume Welder 1. Personal Protective Labor Not specified 1. Lack of available Consuming welding representative exposure or health Equipment electrode information 2. Education and 2. Illness/symptoms training of workers observed in 3. Education and workers training of employers 3. Health effects described in the literature

**Table 7. Survey Responses for Welding Fumes Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for Respondent Hazard Form of Top Actions where Exposure **Exposed** Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 2 Dust Industrial/paper and pulp Boilermaker 1. Lack of available 1. Administrative Labor Replace boiler tubes Fume mills (Electric arc welder exposure or health Controls representative · Repair smoke stack and flue Gas welding) information 2. Personal Protective duct 2. Illness/symptoms Equipment Welding/grinding observed in 3. Engineering Controls workers Boilermaker Oxy/act cutting on dirty 3. Potential for mech. metal exceeding Working around exhaust workplace exposure gas and smoke limit Working in and around dust collection systems Boilermaker • Replacement of bags in dust mech. collection systems Replacement of collector plates in precipitator Confined space entry pressure vessels, etc. Airport Manager 2 Vapor Airport maintenance Maintenance Welding equipment and 1. Potential for 1. Education and training of employers Fume (This element of the job worker exceeding machinery is exercised infrequently. workplace exposure 1. Education and No real concern.) limit training of workers 1. Illness/symptoms 1. Enforcement of observed in workplace workers regulations 1. Health effects 1. Personal Protective described in the Equipment literature 1. Large number of exposed workers

#### Carbon monoxide

Carbon monoxide was mentioned five times, and was the highest ranked hazard for four respondents (see Table 8). Forklift operators, warehouse workers, production workers, office workers, vehicle maintenance technicians, and construction workers were identified as being at risk from carbon monoxide poisoning.

The top concern associated with carbon monoxide was the "potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit" (the highest-ranked concern for all five respondents). The top action suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure was "engineering controls" (the highest-ranked action for four respondents).

#### **Molds**

Molds were mentioned five times, and was the highest ranked hazard for two respondents (see Table 9). Workers located in any building, cable technicians, construction workers, and other workers entering confined spaces were identified as being at risk from mold exposure.

The top concerns associated with molds were the "lack of exposure or health information" and "large number of exposed workers" (both considered the highest-ranked concern for two respondents). The top action suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure was "personal protective equipment" (the highest-ranked action for three respondents).

#### <u>Asphalt</u>

Asphalt was mentioned five times, and was the highest ranked hazard for two respondents (see Table 10). Workers involved in road paving and roofing were identified as being at risk from asphalt exposure.

The top concern associated with asphalt was the "potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit" (the highest-ranked concern for three respondents). The top actions suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure were "personal protective equipment" and "education and training of workers" (both considered the highest-ranked action for three respondents).

Table 8. Survey Responses for Carbon monoxide (including vehicle exhaust and exhaust gases)

Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Government agency health & safety professional	1	Gas	Packaging/warehousing operations	Warehouse workers  Production workers  Forklift operators	<ul> <li>Fish processing</li> <li>Food processing</li> <li>Not specified</li> <li>Not specified</li> </ul>	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Illness/symptoms observed in workers     Health effects described in the literature     Large number of exposed workers	Direct read instrumentation     Enforcement of workplace regulations     Engineering controls
Government agency health & safety professional	1	Gas	Fruit packing / warehouse / truck loading / cold storage	Forklift driver	Not specified	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Illness/symptoms observed in workers     Health effects described in the literature	Engineering controls     Education and training of employers     Enforcement of workplace regulations

Table 8. Survey Responses for Carbon monoxide (including vehicle exhaust and exhaust gases) Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Respondent Hazard Form of where Exposure **Exposed** Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Occurs (Comments) Gas Fruit packing/vegetable Forklift Government 1. Health effects 1. Engineering Moving produce/loading CA agency health & controls packing operators reported by chronic rooms safety exposures (i.e., Unloading/loading trucks central nervous professional system and cardiac Fruit sorters/ Packing fruit/sorting fruit muscle) packers Inspecting fruits 1. Potential for exceeding Office Management/human workplace exposure workers resource and other office limit 1. Health effects described in the literature 1. Large number of exposed workers Worker 1 Fume? Vehicle storage and Maintenance 1. Potential for 1. Engineering Vehicle startup worksites (exhaust Gas Techs. exceeding controls • Equipment operation-job gases/gasoline and workplace exposure 2. Education and site diesel fumes) limit training of workers 2. Lack of available 3. Education and exposure or health training of information employers 3. Health effects described in the

literature

Table 8. Su	rvey Res	ponses fo	r Carbon monoxide (i	ncluding vel	nicle exhaust and exhau	ust gases)	
Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Labor representative	3	Fume?	Not specified (Vehicle Exhaust/ Exhaust fossil fuel)	All crafts	Construction	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Large number of exposed workers     Lack of available exposure or health information	Scheduling     Engineering controls     Administrative controls

Table 9. Survey Responses for Molds Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent **Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of **Exposed** where Exposure Necessary (Ranked) Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** ΑII IH Consultant 1 Not Not specified 1. Lack of available 1. Engineering controls Not specified specified (private exposure or health 2. Personal Protective company) information Equipment 3. Education and training of employers Biological All building based Not specified 1. Proper building and Not specified 1. Employees may Not specified bus inesses (This is by overreact and the maintenance far the most frequent hazard is actually procedures and problem I dealt with as a more stress-related prompt response to consultant. Some water leaks or 1. Illness/symptoms employees experience standing water on observed in real discomfort and or roofs. workers illness, while others in 2. Engineering controls the area become 1. Large number of adversely affected by exposed workers 3. Education and fear concern.) training of employers 3. Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit 3. Health effects described in the literature 3. Lack of available exposure or health information

Table 9. Survey Responses for Molds **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of **Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for Top Actions Respondent Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 2 Liquids Not specified (Waste Cable 1. Potential for 1. Personal Protective Labor · Placing underground cable Molds or technician water/molds and fungi in exceeding Equipment representative fungi underground vaults and workplace exposure 2. Education and limit in manholes) Cable splicer Splicing cables/moves and training of employers changes 2. Lack of available 3. Education and exposure or health training of workers information 3. Large number of exposed workers IH Consultant 2 Solid Construction trades Demolition 1. Lack of available 1. Developing accepted Not specified (private Dust exposure or health mold/microbial company) Vapor? information contaminant Mist standards 2. Illness/symptoms Recon- Not specified observed in 1. Education and struction workers training of workers Other trades/ 2. Health effects 1. Personal Protective Not specified building described in the Equipment occupants literature IH Consultant 2 1. Personal Protective Aerosoliz Most industries Entry 1. Large number of Entering sump pump pits (private workers ed/ sewer lines exposed workers Equipment company) airborne (confined 2. Lack of available 2. Education and · Entering storm drain vaults spores spaces) exposure or health training of employers cisterns, water meter information 3. Education and Crawl spaces under 3. Illness/symptoms training of workers buildings observed in workers

Table 10. Survey Responses for Asphalt (including fumes) **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Respondent Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** 1 Liquid Asphalt industry (Asphalt Topside 1. Illness/symptoms 1. Personal Protective Labor Operate topside antistrip and chevron representative Vapor operator observed in Equipment Operate spreader, Fume 7022 oil. There have workers 2. Engineering controls screedman been some exposures to 2. Lack of available some kind of toxic fumes 3. Administrative Operate rollers exposure or health from a new mix that is on controls information the market now. With this mix design the 3. Potential for contractor had to batch exceeding at a very high workplace exposure temperature to get limit compaction with this high Batch plant Batch asphalt temp. The mix gave off operator Check oil inventories very toxic fumes. The operators and laborers complained of sore eves. nose, and throat and also felt nausea. L&I was contacted. IH Consultant 1. Potential for 1. Education and Dust Road paving Road paver • Exposure to PAHs while (private Vapor training of employers pouring asphalt exceeding Fume workplace exposure company) 1. Education and Asphalt Mist limit training of workers Gas 1. Lack of available 1. Enforcement of exposure or health workplace information regulations 1. Medical surveillance 1. Personal Protective Equipment

Table 10. Survey Responses for Asphalt (including fumes) **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Respondent **Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for Top Actions Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** Workers 2 Vapor Construction, Asphalt raker 1. Potential for 1. Engineering controls Labor Raking fresh asphalt Fume representative road/highway work exceeding 2. Personal Protective Shoveling (Asphalt fumes) workplace exposure Equipment limit Laborer Shoveling 3. Enforcement of 2. Large number of workplace Plant laborer working at exposed workers regulations asphalt plant 3. Illness/symptoms observed in workers IH Consultant 2 Vapor Hot tar roofing Roofer 1. Potential for 1. Education and Exposure to asphalt, vapor, (private Fume mist, fume (PAHs) while exceeding training of employers company) Mist roofing workplace exposure 1. Education and Gas limit training of workers 1. Lack of available 1. Enforcement of exposure or health workplace information regulations 1. Large number of 1. Personal Protective exposed workers Equipment 2 Vapor 1. Health effects Corporate Road construction Road paver 1. Education and Driving paving machine health & safety operator described in the training of workers professional literature 2. Education and Asphalt Shoveling asphalt gravel 2. Large number of training of employers spreader exposed workers Spreading gravel 3. Administrative 3. Lack of available controls Dump truck Dumping out asphalt gravel exposure or health driver

Driving dump truck

information

#### **Bodily Fluids**

Bodily fluids were mentioned five times, and was the highest ranked hazard for four respondents (see Table 11). Workers engaged in health care-related occupations (Paramedics/Emergency Medical Technicians, nurses, and instructors) in addition to laboratory technicians and corrections officers were identified as being at risk from exposure to bodily fluids. Note that other respondents mentioned several biological exposures and pathogens associated with bodily fluids, although they are not included in Table 11 (see the entries in Table B-1 under OIICS Source Code 53 - Infectious and parasitic agents). These hazards included "bloodborne pathogens" (mentioned by three respondents), "AIDS", "Hepatitis B", "airborne pathogens" and "blood products" (each mentioned by one respondent; exposure in the health care industry was the primary concern).

There was no agreement on either the top concerns associated with exposure to bodily fluids or the actions required to reduce or eliminate exposures.

#### **Solvents**

Solvents were mentioned four times, and was the highest ranked hazard for three respondents (see Table 12). A variety of workers in several industries were identified as being at risk from solvent exposure. Note that other respondents mentioned solvents when describing exposures to Paints (see Table 5) and Isocyanates (see Table 6.). In addition, other respondents mentioned individual solvents (see Table B-1), although they are not included in Table 12: methylene chloride (mentioned by two respondents), methyl ethyl ketone, and turpentine (each mentioned by one respondent).

The top concern associated with solvents was "illness/symptoms observed in workers", including skin irritation (the highest-ranked concern for three respondents). The top action suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure was "education and training of workers" (the highest-ranked action for three respondents).

### <u>Asbestos</u>

Asbestos was mentioned four times, and was the highest ranked hazard for three respondents (see Table 13). A variety of workers in several industries were identified as being at risk from asbestos exposure.

There was no agreement on the top concerns associated with exposure to asbestos. The top action suggested to reduce or eliminate exposure was "personal protective equipment" (the highest-ranked action for three respondents).

Table 11. Survey Responses for Bodily Fluids Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Hazard Form of where Exposure **Exposed** Workers **Exposed Workers** Occupation Rank Occurs (Comments) Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Hazard Worker 1 Solid Firefighting, Emergency Firefighter/ 1. Medical surveillance Venipuncture 1. Illness/symptoms medical service (EMS) Liquid paramedic observed in 2. Personal Protective Intubation Mist workers Equipment Wound treatment 2. Large number of 3. Education and exposed workers Firefighter training of workers Wound treatment 3. Lack of available EMT Application of oxygen exposure or health information • CPR Fire captain Wound treatment EMT • CPR 1. Potential for 1. Education and Corporate Liquid Cancer research clinic Nurses • Collecting fluids samples developing life training of workers health & safety Cleaning hickman lines professional threatening illness 2. Education and (HIV, HBV, HCV) Phleboto-• Drawing and handling blood training of employers mists 3. Personal Protective Equipment Lab Processing body fluids technicians samples

Table 11. Survey Responses for Bodily Fluids Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Tasks Performed by Occupation Rank Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Hazard Occurs (Comments) Solid Paramedic 1. Shifts are 24+ 1. Administrative Labor Emergency medical Emergency medical services (Sleep representative Liquid hours long without controls (work shift response and transportation Vapor deprivation increases the adequate rest modification to Mist likelihood of exposure to ensure rest periods Emergency Emergency medical 1. Health effects of adequate length) blood- and bodily fluidmedical response and transportation described in the borne pathogens technician 2. Enforcement of literature workplace 3. Potential for regulations exceeding workplace exposure limit Solid Corrections 1. Administrative Corrections County Jail 1. Large number of Supervising inmates Officer – County Liquid officer exposed workers controls Stopping fights/assaults Jail Vapor 2. Overall number of 2. Personal Protective Mist Stopping suicide attempts injuries to officers Equipment and Sergeants 3. Engineering controls Corrections Supervising corrections 3. Illness/symptoms Sgt. officers observed in Stopping fights/assaults workers • Stopping suicide attempts

Table 11. Survey Responses for Bodily Fluids Job Title of **Physical** Industry/Business Respondent Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Hazard Form of where Exposure Exposed Necessary (Ranked) **Exposed Workers** Occupation Rank Occurs (Comments) Concern (Ranked) Hazard Workers 2 Liauid 1. Potential for Government Health care settings, Instructors • Practicing procedures on 1. Engineering controls agency health & Mist including phlebotomy, students or other humans exceeding 2. Education and workplace exposure nursing courses. safety training of employers professional limit (The number one action 3. Education and most effective in 2. Health effects training of workers reducing needle stick or described in the exposures bloodborne literature pathogens is eliminating 3. Large number of procedure that puts exposed workers employee or student at a Students Practicing procedures on hazard. If not feasible. students or other living using sharps with humans engineering sharps injury protections whenever using sharps on live humans and practicing phlebotomy on manikins. Education is a necessary second step.)

Table 12. Survey Responses for Solvents **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Tasks Performed by Respondent Hazard Form of Top Reasons for Top Actions where Exposure Exposed Occupation Rank Hazard Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) **Occurs (Comments)** Liauid Sawmill Maintenance Mechanic. 1. Large number of 1. Engineering controls Labor 1 Cleaning of parts Fume? rolling stock exposed workers representative (Parts cleaning solvents) 2. Education and Assembling parts Mist 2. Potential for training of workers Quality control exceeding 3. Personal Protective workplace exposure Millwright · Cleaning of parts Equipment limit Assembling parts 3. Health effects described in the Quality control literature Machinist · Cleaning of parts Handling of parts for remanufacture Assembly of parts EH&S FH&S Liauid Research facilities · Waste collection and 1. Potential for 1. Poorly maintained policies, poor **Technologist** Vapor (Simultaneous Technolotransportation exceeding (Hazardous Mist exposures from a xylene workplace exposure preventative aists Waste processing materials & limit maintenance of still and bulking operation located in the engineering controls waste) Waste bulking and recycling 1. Illness/symptoms same room. No and lab packing observed in 1. Education and ventilation in hold of workers training of employers trucks represents a Waste Waste lab packing confined space that 1. Health effects 1. Education and handlers · Waste bulking and exceeds TLVs. This was described in the training of workers (contractors) brought to the attention processing literature 1. Enforcement of of management, but no Loading and transporting 1. Lack of available workplace actions were taken to exposure or health regulations date. No exposure Industrial Recycling information monitoring has been 1. Medical surveillance hygienist taken. There are Waste neutralization and 1. Large number of 1. Personal Protective ineffective risk remediation exposed workers Equipment communication and Waste treatment management policies.) 1. Engineering Controls

**Table 12. Survey Responses for Solvents** Industry/Business Job Title of **Physical** Respondent Hazard **Exposed Tasks Performed by** Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Form of where Exposure Occupation Workers **Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Rank Hazard **Occurs (Comments)** Research 1. Potential for Academic IH or 1 Liquid Laboratories Making standards/test 1. Education and researcher Scientist atmospheres. (Acetone/MEI) exceeding training of workers workplace exposure 2. Personal Protective Cleaning parts limit Equipment 1. Skin irritation Student Res. • Collecting bench test data Asst. Preparing gas/vapor standards Not specified 1. Education and Government Vapor Painters Painting 1. Illness/symptoms agency health & observed in training of workers Prepping surfaces safety workers 2. Education and professional 2. Health effects Printers training of employers · Cleaning rollers described in the 3. Engineering controls literature 2. Large number of exposed workers

Table 13. Survey Responses for Asbestos **Physical** Industry/Business Job Title of Tasks Performed by Top Reasons for **Top Actions** Respondent Hazard Form of where Exposure **Exposed** Occupation Rank **Workers Exposed Workers** Concern (Ranked) Necessary (Ranked) Hazard **Occurs (Comments)** Labor 1 Dust Potrooms, courtyards Carbon Setter Sweeping 1. Large number of 1. Personal Protective Equipment exposed workers representative Cleaning courtyards 2. Administrative 2. Potential for controls exceeding workplace exposure limit 3. Engineering controls Pot Tender Sweeping 3. Illness/symptoms Cleaning courtyards observed in workers IH Consultant 1 Dust Asbestos abatement Air monitoring 1. Health effects 1. Personal Protective · Perform air monitoring (private technician described in the Equipment and inspections literature company) 2. Education and 2. Lack of available training of employers exposure or health 3. Education and information training of workers 3. Large number of exposed workers Airport Manager Dust Airport industrial park Maintenance · Removal or installation of 1. Potential for 1. Education and worker asbestos shingles exceeding workplace training of employers exposure limit 1. Education and Removal of asbestos hard 1. Illness/symptoms training of workers board observed in workers 1. Enforcement of 1. Health effects workplace described in the regulations literature 1. Personal Protective 1. Lack of available Equipment exposure or health information 1. Large number of exposed workers

Table 13. S	Survey Res	ponses for	Asbestos				
Respondent Occupation	Hazard Rank	Physical Form of Hazard	Industry/Business where Exposure Occurs (Comments)	Job Title of Exposed Workers	Tasks Performed by Exposed Workers	Top Reasons for Concern (Ranked)	Top Actions Necessary (Ranked)
Not specified	2	Solid? Dust	Boiler Repair	Boilermaker	<ul> <li>Removing insulation on steam pipes</li> <li>Removing gasket material</li> <li>Removing insulation coating on steel</li> </ul>	Potential for exceeding workplace exposure limit     Illness/symptoms observed in workers     Large number of exposed workers	Education and training of employers     Education and training of workers     Enforcement of workplace regulations

### **Industries Associated with the Principal Hazards**

Many respondents provided insufficient information to assign four-digit SIC codes to their specified industry of concern. Consequently, businesses were coded at the Industry Division level. (Each Division is comprised of several Major Industry Groups, which are denoted by two-digit SIC codes.)

The Industry Divisions associated with the ten most frequently mentioned hazards are summarized in Table 14. The following Industry Divisions were not associated with these hazards and were excluded from the table: Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing (Division A); Retail Trade (Division G); and Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate (Division H).

The most frequently mentioned Industry Division was Construction (22 hazard mentions), in which silica and asphalt were the primary hazards of concern. Se ven of the ten most frequently mentioned hazards were associated with the construction industry.

The next most frequently mentioned industry (Services) was mentioned 11 times; eight of the ten most frequently mentioned hazards were associated with this Industry Division.

			Nui	mber of Hazard Menti	ons by Indust	ry Division:			
Hazard	Division B: Mining	Division C: Construction	Division D: Manufacturing	Division E: Transportation, Communications, Electric, Gas, and Sanitary Services	Division F: Wholesale Trade	Division I: Services	Division J: Public Administration	Not Classifiable	TOTAL
Silica (including abrasive blasting, silica dusts, and fibrous siliceous dusts)	1	10				1			12
Paints (including "fumes" and coatings)		3	2			2			7
Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethanes)		1	2			2		2	7
Welding fumes		1	1	1		2		1	6
Carbon monoxide (including vehicle exhaust and exhaust gases)			1	1	2			1	5
Molds		1						4	5
Asphalt (including fumes)		5							5
Bodily fluids				1		1	2	1	5
Solvents			1			2		1	4
Asbestos		1	1	1		1			4
TOTAL	1	22	8	4	2	11	2	10	60

### **Discussion**

The survey of occupational chemical and biological hazards was the first such study conducted in Washington State. By soliciting the opinions of a broad spectrum of stakeholders, we anticipated gathering data that would help prioritize workplace hazards for public health intervention. However, the poor response to the survey did not allow us to draw conclusions about the relative importance of the hazards identified. Further, additional hazards that may be of great importance may have not have been mentioned by the relatively few respondents. Nonetheless, the survey data may be used as a starting point for working with stakeholders to further evaluate the specified hazards and identify appropriate education and outreach activities. A more effective use of this survey instrument may be to target stakeholders associated with specific industry sectors.

A striking feature of the principal hazards identified (especially silica, paints, welding fumes, carbon monoxide, asphalt, bodily fluids, solvents, and asbestos) is that they have been recognized as causes of illness in the working population for decades, if not centuries. Clearly, there continues to be a need to develop and implement effective prevention and outreach activities aimed at reducing or eliminating exposures to these well-documented hazards. The construction industry was mentioned most frequently; the principal hazards associated with this industry were silica and asphalt.

Other hazards identified in this study may be considered as "emerging". For example, although isocyanates have been recognized as a hazard for decades in the automotive painting industry (NIOSH 1996b), the relatively recent use of these substances as coatings for truck bed liners and other surfaces deserves attention (Lofgren et al. 2003). Similarly, it has been suggested that mold exposures in office environments have become more problematic since the relatively recent advent of "tight buildings" and the reliance on complex ventilation and air conditioning units to supply fresh air to building occupants. Again, there is a vital need for health & safety professionals to characterize these exposures and effectively communicate the concomitant risks to concerned workers and employers.

The concern mentioned most frequently in association with the principal hazards was the potential for exceeding the workplace exposure limit; this was the top concern associated with exposure to silica, paints, welding fumes, carbon monoxide, and asphalt. Clearly, there is a need for health & safety professionals to evaluate exposures relative to Permissible Exposure Limits and to mitigate exposures that exceed workplace standards.

According to the "hierarchy of industrial hygiene controls", personal protective equipment (PPE) should be viewed as the last line of defense against exposure to hazardous materials. Engineering- and administrative- controls should always be considered before relying on PPE to protect workers. However, survey respondents ranked PPE as the most effective means to reduce or eliminate exposures to silica, paints, welding fumes, molds, asphalt, and asbestos. While PPE may be the only practicable solution in certain circumstances, there is a critical need for health & safety professionals to evaluate these exposures, so that workers are not dependent on PPE.

Readers interested in discussing the hazards identified in this study are encouraged to contact the SHARP Program at 1-888-66-SHARP.

## References

- Baggs J et al. 2000. Workers' Compensation Based Surveillance of Asthma, Hospitalized Burns, and Adult Blood Lead Levels in Washington State, 1994-1998. Technical report 64-1-2000. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.
- Baggs J, Curwick C, Silverstein B. 2002. Work-Related Burns in Washington State, 1994 to 1998. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 44(7), 692-699.
- Cohen M, Kalat J, Silverstein S. 1999. Work-Related Traumatic Head and Brain Injuries in Washington State, 1990-1997. Technical report 57-1-1999. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.
- Department of Health. 2002a. Work-related Asthma. In: *The Health of Washington State*, July 2002. Available from: *http://www.doh.wa.gov/HWS*.
- Department of Health. 2002b. Fatal Occupational Injuries. In: *The Health of Washington State*, July 2002. Available from: http://www.doh.wa.gov/HWS.
- Drozdowsky SL. 2000. Development of a workplace chemical ranking system to identify the chemicals most hazardous to workers in Washington. Thesis (M.E.S.). The Evergreen State College.
- Foley M. 2002. Violence in Washington Workplaces, 1995-2000. Technical report 39-4-2002. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.
- Greife A, Young R, Carroll M, Sieber WK, Pedersen D, Sundin D, Seta J. 1995. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health general industry occupational exposure databases: Their structure, capabilities, and limitations. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 10(4), 264-269.
- Lofgren DJ et al. 2003. MDI exposure for spray-on truck bed lining. Submitted to Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene Journal.

- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 1988. National occupational exposure survey field guidelines. Vol. I. Seta JA, Sundin DS, Pedersen DH, eds. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 88-106.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 1989a. National occupational exposure survey sampling methodology. Vol. II. Sieber WK, ed. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 89-102.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 1989b. National occupational exposure survey analysis of management interview responses. Vol. III. Pedersen DH, Sieber WK, eds. Cincinnati, OH: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 89-103.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 1996a. National Occupational Research Agenda, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, April 1996. Available from: <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/tools.html#surveils">http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/tools.html#surveils</a>
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. 1996b. NIOSH Alert: Preventing asthma and death from diisocyanate exposure. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 96-111. Available from: <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/asthma.html">http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/asthma.html</a>.
- Sama S et al. 1998. Work-Related Skin Disorders in Washington State, 1993-1997. Technical report 36-4-1998. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.
- Silverstein B, Kalat J. 2002. Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders of the Neck, Back and Upper Extremity in Washington State, 1992-2000. Technical report 40-6-2002. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.
- Whittaker SG, Curwick CC. 2001. Surveillance for Occupational Lead Poisoning, State of Washington, 1993-2001: Incorporating data from May 15, 1993 through June 30, 2001. Technical report 44-3-2001. Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention, Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, Olympia, Washington.

# Appendix A:

**Chemical and Biological Hazards Survey** 



# STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention (SHARP)

PO Box 44330, Olympia, WA 98504-4330 (360) 902-5669

October 22, 2001

Dear Safety & Health Professional:

The SHARP Program is asking for the safety & health community's help in setting our research, education, and outreach priorities. Washington workplaces contain numerous chemical and biological hazards that have the potential to cause adverse health effects, like cancer, asthma, and skin problems. While Workers' Compensation data can be used to identify work-related injuries, these data are less useful for tracking chemical and biological exposures that cause adverse health problems. SHARP has therefore developed a *Survey of Chemical and Biological Hazards* to help identify the most serious chemical and biological hazards in Washington workplaces and the workers who are exposed to them. The survey is being distributed to labor organizations, businesses, and health & safety professionals across Washington State.

Your input is critically important in this effort. We are asking you to describe up to three chemical or biological hazards that you think are the biggest problems in Washington workplaces. "Chemical hazards" are any form (solid, liquid, or gas) of a hazardous chemical substance (including dusts, vapors, mists, fumes, etc.). "Biological hazards" include animal tissues (e.g., meats), bodily fluids (like blood, urine, or feces), bacteria, viruses, molds, or fungi.

Please return the completed **survey** and **cover sheet** to the SHARP Program **no later than** November 16, 2001 in the enclosed postage-paid return envelope or fax it to 360-902-5672. SHARP's mission is to conduct research, monitoring, and demonstration projects that promote healthy work environments and the prevention of workplace injuries and illnesses. **SHARP does not enforce regulations, compliance, or penalties.** All information you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence. We will not share any information that would identify a survey participant with anyone. We will only publish data that summarizes information for all respondents combined (with no identifying information).

Although you may complete this survey anonymously, please provide your contact information if you would like to discuss your selection with SHARP researchers or receive a copy of the survey results. Your name and affiliation will not be shared with anyone outside of the SHARP Program.

Please call SHARP toll-free at 1-888-66-SHARP (1-888-667-4277) or e-mail me at *whiw235@LNI.wa.gov\_*if you have any questions about this survey. For more information about SHARP, please visit our web site at *www.LNI.wa.gov/sharp*.

Thank you for helping SHARP protect Washington's workers from hazardous exposures!

Sincerely,

Steve Whittaker, Ph.D. SHARP Toxicologist

Enclosures



# STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention (SHARP)

PO Box 44330, Olympia, WA 98504-4330 (360) 902-5669

October 22, 2001

#### Dear Labor Representative:

The SHARP Program is asking for organized labor's help in setting our research, education, and outreach priorities. Washington workplaces contain numerous chemical and biological hazards that have the potential to cause adverse health effects, like cancer, asthma, and skin problems. While Workers' Compensation data can be used to identify work-related injuries, these data are less useful for tracking chemical and biological exposures that cause adverse health problems. SHARP has therefore developed a *Survey of Chemical and Biological Hazards* to help identify the most serious chemical and biological hazards in Washington workplaces and the workers who are exposed to them. The survey is being distributed to labor organizations, businesses, and health & safety professionals across Washington State.

The input of Washington's working men and women is critically important in this effort. We are asking that you identify a suitably qualified individual within your labor organization to complete this survey. We would like your representative to describe up to three chemical or biological hazards that he or she thinks are the biggest problems in Washington workplaces. "Chemical hazards" are any form (solid, liquid, or gas) of a hazardous chemical substance (including dusts, vapors, mists, fumes, etc.). "Biological hazards" include animal tissues (e.g., meats), bodily fluids (like blood, urine, or feces), bacteria, viruses, molds, or fungi.

Please have your representative return the completed **survey** <u>and</u> **cover sheet** to the SHARP Program **no later than** <u>November 16, 2001</u> - in the enclosed postage-paid return envelope or fax it to 360-902-5672. SHARP's mission is to conduct research, monitoring, and demonstration projects that promote healthy work environments and the prevention of workplace injuries and illnesses. **SHARP does not enforce regulations, compliance, or penalties.** All information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence. We will not share any information that would identify a survey participant with anyone. We will only publish data that summarizes information for all respondents combined (with no identifying information).

Although this survey may be completed anonymously, the survey respondent may provide contact information if he or she would like to discuss the selection with SHARP researchers or receive a copy of the survey results. Participants' names and affiliations will not be shared with anyone outside of the SHARP Program.

Please call SHARP toll-free at 1-888-66-SHARP (1-888-667-4277) or e-mail me at *whiw235@LNI.wa.gov\_*if you have any questions about this survey. For more information about SHARP, please visit our web site at *www.LNI.wa.gov/sharp*.

Thank you for helping SHARP protect Washington's workers from hazardous exposures!

Sincerely,

Steve Whittaker, Ph.D. SHARP Toxicologist

Enclosures



# STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES Safety & Health Assessment & Research for Prevention (SHARP)

PO Box 44330, Olympia, WA 98504-4330 (360) 902-5669

January 3, 2002

Dear Business Association Member:

The SHARP Program is asking for the business community's help in setting our research, education, and outreach priorities. Washington workplaces contain numerous chemical and biological hazards that have the potential to cause adverse health effects, like cancer, asthma, and skin problems. While Workers' Compensation data can be used to identify work-related injuries, these data are less useful for tracking chemical and biological exposures that cause adverse health problems. SHARP has therefore developed a *Survey of Chemical and Biological Hazards* to help identify the most serious chemical and biological hazards in Washington workplaces and the workers who are exposed to them. The survey is being distributed to labor organizations, businesses, and health & safety professionals across Washington State.

The input of Washington's business community is critically important in this effort. We are asking that you identify a suitably qualified individual within your association to complete this survey. We would like your representative to describe up to three chemical or biological hazards that he or she thinks are the biggest problems in Washington workplaces. "Chemical hazards" are any form (solid, liquid, or gas) of a hazardous chemical substance (including dusts, vapors, mists, fumes, etc.). "Biological hazards" include animal tissues (e.g., meats), bodily fluids (like blood, urine, or feces), bacteria, viruses, molds, or fungi.

Please have your representative return the completed **survey** <u>and</u> **cover sheet** to the SHARP Program **no later than** <u>February 15, 2002</u> - in the enclosed postage-paid return envelope or fax it to 360-902-5672. SHARP's mission is to conduct research, monitoring, and demonstration projects that promote healthy work environments and the prevention of workplace injuries and illnesses. **SHARP does not enforce regulations, compliance, or penalties.** All information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence. We will not share any information that would identify a survey participant with anyone. We will only publish data that summarizes information for all respondents combined (with no identifying information).

Although this survey may be completed anonymously, the survey respondent may provide contact information if he or she would like to discuss the selection with SHARP researchers or receive a copy of the survey results. Participants' names and affiliations will not be shared with anyone outside of the SHARP Program.

Please call SHARP toll-free at 1-888-66-SHARP (1-888-667-4277) or e-mail me at *whiw235@LNI.wa.gov\_*if you have any questions about this survey. For more information about SHARP, please visit our web site at *www.LNI.wa.gov/sharp*.

Thank you for helping SHARP protect Washington's workers from hazardous exposures!

Sincerely,

Steve Whittaker, Ph.D. SHARP Toxicologist

**Enclosures** 

#### - COVER SHEET -

# SHARP's Survey of Chemical and Biological Hazards in Washington State Workplaces

#### **SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS**

In order to help us correctly record your concern, please provide the precise name of the hazard, rather than using general terms like "metal", "solvent", or "pesticide". For a specific product, please provide the manufacturer's and the product's name as they appear on the MSDS. You may include a copy of the MSDS in the return envelope. If you cannot identify the chemical or locate the MSDS, you may provide a detailed description on the reverse side of the survey sheet. **Please use a black or dark blue pen to complete the survey. Please print any handwritten comments.** 

Please rank your hazards in order of importance. For example, the sheet entitled "Hazard #1" should be the hazard that you think is most important and "Hazard #3" the least important. You may submit only one or two hazards for consideration. An example of a completed survey is attached for your information.

Please return the completed survey <u>and</u> this cover sheet to the SHARP Program in the enclosed postage-paid return envelope no later than <u>November 16, 2001</u>. You may also fax them to 360-902-5672 (please be sure to fax both sides if you have made notes on the reverse of the survey). If you would like additional copies, please contact SHARP at 1-888-66-SHARP or download a copy from our web site at <u>www.LNI.wa.gov/sharp/HazChem</u>.

#### WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?

Which	ioh title	hest	describes	vour	position (	(nlease	check	only	one).
* * 111011	լоо աա	, ncst	describes	v Oui	DOSIGOI	Dicase	CHCCK		OHC /.

- o Labor representative
- o Employer
- o Worker
- o Government agency health & safety professional
- o Corporate health & safety professional
- o IH Consultant (private company)
- o Academic IH or researcher
- o Plant or facility health & safety professional
- o Other (specify)

#### **CONTACT INFORMATION (OPTIONAL)**

Although you may complete this survey anonymously, please provide contact information if you would like to discuss your selection with SHARP researchers or receive a copy of the results. Your name and affiliation will not be shared with anyone outside of the SHARP Program:

Name (Last, First):	
Affiliation:	_
Phone: ()	
Fax: ()	
E-mail:	

# -EXAMPLE

## HAZARD #1

AUARICAI IOLA	a of housed (about al	that ampha	
	n of hazard (check al		_
o Solid	/ \	o Fume	o Gas
o Dust	o Vapor		XOther (specify) DROPLETS
			POSPACE / MACHINE SHO hat tasks do they perform? (List in rank order of exposure):
	MACHINIS		1. MACHINING PARTS
			2 MACHINE MAINTENANCE
			3 PART CLEAN-UP
Job Title 2.	ASSEMBL	ER_ Job Task	1 CLEANING OFF PARTS
			2 ASSEMBLING PARTS
		V/1000000000000000000000000000000000000	3.
Job Title 3.	SUPERVISO	∆ < Job Task	1. INSPECTING PARTS
		Job Task	2 MACHINE MAINTENANCE
		1.7100000000000000000000000000000000000	3
Why is this	hazard a concern? (	Rank in order of cond	cern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is the
1 Potenti	hazard a concern? ( em): ial for exceeding work! symptoms observed in	place exposure limit	
1 Potenti	em): ial for exceeding work	place exposure limit n workers	2 Lack of available exposure or health Information
Potenti 3 Illness/ 4 Health  What action (Rank in orde)	em): ial for exceeding work; symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, wh tion and training of em	place exposure limit in workers ne literature d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef	Lack of available exposure or health information     Large number of exposed workers     Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  flective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipments
Potential Potential Illness/ Health  What action (Rank in order Beducat Beduca	em): ial for exceeding work; symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, white tion and training of em tion and training of wo	place exposure limit in workers he literature  d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef	Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  ffective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipments  Workplace controls – administrative controls
Potential Potential Illness/ Health  What action (Rank in order Beducat Beduca	em): ial for exceeding work; symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, wh tion and training of em	place exposure limit in workers he literature  d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef	Lack of available exposure or health information     Large number of exposed workers     Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  flective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipment
Potential Potent	em): ial for exceeding work; symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, white tion and training of em tion and training of wo	place exposure limit in workers he literature  d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef ployers rkers gulations	Lack of available exposure or health information     Large number of exposed workers     Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  ffective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipments  Workplace controls – administrative controls
Potential Potential Illness/ Health  What action (Rank in order Beducat Health Health)  Educat Health Health  Mhat action (Rank in order Health)  Mhat action (Rank in order Health)  Mhat action (Rank in order Health)	em): ial for exceeding work; symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, white tion and training of em tion and training of wo ement of workplace re al surveillance (physical tests, etc.)	place exposure limit in workers he literature  d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef ployers rkers gulations al exams, blood or	2 Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  Ifective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipments  Workplace controls – administrative controls  Workplace controls – engineering controls  Other (specify)
Dowest conce  1 Potenti 3 Illness/ 4 Health  What action (Rank in orde) 5 Educat 6 Educat 7 Medicaturine Personal prote Administrative	em): ial for exceeding work; (symptoms observed in effects described in the as do you think would er of effectiveness, white tion and training of em tion and training of wo ement of workplace re al surveillance (physical tests, etc.) ective equipment includes go controls include job rotation	place exposure limit in workers he literature  d be the most effect here "1" is the most ef ployers rkers gulations all exams, blood or loves, gauntiets, coveralls in or other work shift modi	2 Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  Ive In reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  ffective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipments  Workplace controls – administrative controls  Workplace controls – engineering controls

Comments

SEE ATTACHED MSDS

### HAZARD #1

Physi	cal form of l	hazard (check	all that apply)	<b>)</b> :	
0 S	olid	o Liquid	o Fume		o Gas
o D	ust	o Vapor	o Mist		o Other (specify)
ndusi	try/business	s where exposu	ıre occurs:		
Nhat :	are the iob t	titles of the exp	osed worker	s and wha	t tasks do they perform? (List in rank order of exposure)
300	7 TILIC 1				
Job	Title 2.				
Job	Title 3				
				Job Task 2.	
lowe	est concern): _ Potential fo		(Rank in orde	Job Task 2. Job Task 3. er of concei	
lowe	st concern): _ Potential for _ Illness/sym	r exceeding wor	(Rank in orderkplace exposed in workers	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  er of concer  ure limit	rn, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is th  Lack of available exposure or health information
lowe	st concern): _ Potential for _ Illness/symp _ Health effect t actions do	r exceeding wor ptoms observed cts described in	(Rank in orderkplace exposition workers the literature	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  er of concer  ure limit	rn, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is th Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers
Wha (Ran	st concern):  Potential for Illness/symp Health effect t actions do k in order of	r exceeding wor ptoms observed cts described in	(Rank in orderkplace exposition workers the literature where "1" is the	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  er of concer  ure limit  st effective e most effe	rn, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is th  Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  e in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?
Wha (Ran	est concern):  Potential for Illness/symp Health effect t actions do k in order of Education a	r exceeding wor ptoms observed cts described in you think wou effectiveness, v	(Rank in orderkplace exposed in workers the literature all de the month where "1" is the month of the month o	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  er of concer  ure limit  st effective e most effe	rn, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is th  Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  e in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?  ctive action and "8" is the least effective):
Wha (Ran	st concern):  Potential for Illness/symp Health effect It actions do Ik in order of Education a	r exceeding wor ptoms observed cts described in byou think wou effectiveness, v	(Rank in orderkplace exposition workers the literature where "1" is the moloyers workers	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  er of concer  ure limit  st effective e most effer	rn, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is th  Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  e in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard? ctive action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipment <sup>a</sup>

#### Comments

Please use the reverse side of this sheet to provide additional information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup>Engineering controls include enclosure of the process (e.g., glove box), wetting the process, enclosure of the employee (e.g., control room), remote/robotic control, local exhaust ventilation (e.g., hood at source), and dilution ventilation (e.g., fans, general ventilation).

#### HAZARD #2

hysical form	of hazard (check	all that apply):	
o Solid	o Liquid	o Fume	o Gas
o Dust	o Vapor	o Mist	o Other (specify)
j	·		d what tasks do they perform? (List in rank order of exposure)
	ob titles of the exp		
JOD TIME 1.			ask 1ask 2
			ask 3
Job Title 2.			ask 1
_			ask 2.
			ask 3.
Job Title 3.			ask 1
		JUD 1	ask 2
Potentia Illness/s	rn):	Job T (Rank in order of or other contents of the contents of t	ask 3  concern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is the mit Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers
Potentia — Illness/s — Health 6	rn): al for exceeding wor symptoms observed effects described in s do you think wou	Job T  (Rank in order of orkplace exposure ling in workers the literature all the most effective in the literature all the liter	ask 3  concern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is the mit Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers
Potentia — Potentia — Illness/s — Health 6  What actions (Rank in orde	rn): al for exceeding wor symptoms observed effects described in s do you think wou	Job T  (Rank in order of or the content of or the content of or the content of or the content of order of or the content of order or the content or the c	Large number of exposed workers Other (specify)  Fective in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?
Potentia — Potentia — Illness/s — Health 6  What actions (Rank in orde) — Educati	rn): al for exceeding work symptoms observed effects described in as do you think wou er of effectiveness, v	Job T  (Rank in order of or rkplace exposure ling in workers the literature all the most effort where "1" is the most mployers	concern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is the mit Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers Other (specify)  Fective in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard? It is effective action and "8" is the least effective):
Potentia Potentia Illness/s Health e  What actions (Rank in orde Educati Educati	rn): al for exceeding work symptoms observed effects described in as do you think wou er of effectiveness, wo	Job T  (Rank in order of orkplace exposure ling in workers the literature in the literature in the most effort where "1" is the "1" is the most effort where "1" is the most effort where "1" is the "1" is the "1" is the	concern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is the mit Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers Other (specify)  Fective in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard? st effective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipment <sup>a</sup>

#### Comments

Please use the reverse side of this sheet to provide additional information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup>Engineering controls include enclosure of the process (e.g., glove box), wetting the process, enclosure of the employee (e.g., control room), remote/robotic control, local exhaust ventilation (e.g., hood at source), and dilution ventilation (e.g., fans, general ventilation).

#### HAZARD #3

	o Solid	o Liquid	o Fume	o Gas
	o Dust	o Vapor	o Mist	o Other (specify)
lr	ndustry/busin	ess where exposu	ıre occurs:	
V	/hat are the jo	bb titles of the exp	osed workers and wh	nat tasks do they perform? (List in rank order of exposure
J	ob Title 1		Job Task 1.	
			Job Task 2.	
J	ob Title 2			
J	ob Title 3.			
	Mhia khia h		Job Task 2. Job Task 3.	
	lowest conceri Potentia Illness/s	n):	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  (Rank in order of concerts)  kplace exposure limit I in workers	eern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is t Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers
	lowest concern Potentia Illness/sy Health e	n): I for exceeding wor ymptoms observed ffects described in do you think wou	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  (Rank in order of concerts place exposure limit lin workers the literature	ern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is t Lack of available exposure or health information
	lowest concert Potentia Illness/sy Health e  What actions (Rank in order	n): I for exceeding wor ymptoms observed ffects described in do you think wou	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  (Rank in order of conditions of	eern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is t  Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  ve in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard?
	lowest concert Potentia Illness/sy Health e  What actions (Rank in order	n): I for exceeding wor ymptoms observed ffects described in  do you think wou of effectiveness, v	Job Task 2.  Job Task 3.  (Rank in order of conditions of	tern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is to Lack of available exposure or health information Large number of exposed workers Other (specify)  ve in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard? fective action and "8" is the least effective):
	lowest concern Potentia Illness/sy Health e  What actions (Rank in order Education Education	n): I for exceeding work ymptoms observed ffects described in  do you think wou of effectiveness, we on and training of ele	Job Task 2. Job Task 3.  (Rank in order of conditions of c	eern, where "1" is the primary reason for concern and "6" is t  Lack of available exposure or health information  Large number of exposed workers  Other (specify)  ve in reducing or eliminating exposures to this hazard? fective action and "8" is the least effective):  Workplace controls – personal protective equipment <sup>a</sup>

<sup>c</sup>Engineering controls include enclosure of the process (e.g., glove box), wetting the process, enclosure of the employee (e.g., control room), remote/robotic control, local exhaust ventilation (e.g., hood at source), and dilution ventilation (e.g., fans, general ventilation).

#### Comments

Please use the reverse side of this sheet to provide additional information

**Appendix B:** 

**Hazards Identified** 

Table B-1. Hazards Identified by Survey Respondents				
	Numbe	er of Mention	ns as:	
OIICS Source/Hazard	Hazard Rank #1	Hazard Rank #2	Hazard Rank #3	Total
Chemicals and chemical products, unspecified (00)				10
Analytical reagents		1		1
Biological and chemical agents	1			1
Chemical and biological hazards		1		1
Chemical carcinogens		1		1
Chemicals	1			1
Confined spaces			1	1
Hazardous materials	1			1
Reproductive toxins			1	1
Test gases		1		1
VOCs			1	1
Acids (01)				1
Acids			1	1
Alkalis (02)				2
Cement mix-C34	1			1
Dust (Concrete/sheetrock)		1		1
Aromatics and hydrocarbon derivatives, except halogenated (03)				3
Formaldehyde	1			1
Gluteraldehyde	1			1
Methyl ethyl ketone	1			1
Halogens and halogen compounds (04)				6
Chlorine	1			1
Chlorine dioxide		1		1
Fluoride		1		1
Isoflurane	1			1
Methylene chloride	2			2

Table B-1. Hazards Identified by Survey Respondents					
	Numbe	er of Mention	ns as:		
OIICS Source/Hazard	Hazard Rank #1	Hazard Rank #2	Hazard Rank #3	Total	
Metallic particulates, trace elements, dusts, powders, fumes (05)				12	
Aluminum		1		1	
Beryllium	1			1	
Hard metals		1		1	
Lead		1		1	
Metals	1			1	
Veral dust (silver dust)	1			1	
Welding fumes	4	2		6	
Agricultural chemicals and other pesticides (06)				2	
Pesticides	1	1		2	
Chemical products – general (07)				27	
Buried drop wire splices (Splicing chemicals)		1		1	
Chemical for copier (including toner)	1	1		2	
Cleaning materials			1	1	
Hair chemicals			1	1	
Lacquer thinner		1		1	
Metalworking fluids		1	2	3	
Organic vapors (Glues/mastics)		1		1	
Paint (including fumes and coatings)	4	2	1	7	
Photographic chemicals		1		1	
PVC glue		1		1	
Research pharmaceuticals		1		1	
Silicon lubricant	1			1	
Solvents	3		1	4	
Tear gas	1			1	
Turpentine			1	1	

Table B-1. Hazards Identified by Survey Respondents					
	Numbe	r of Mentior	ns as:		
OIICS Source/Hazard	Hazard Rank #1	Hazard Rank #2	Hazard Rank #3	Total	
Coal, natural gas, petroleum fuels and products, nec (08)				5	
Coal tar pitch (including volatiles)			2	2	
Gasoline			1	1	
Oil smoke		1		1	
Petroleum coke	1			1	
Other chemicals (09)				28	
Ammonia	2			2	
Carbon monoxide (including vehicle exhaust and exhaust gases)	4		1	5	
Chemical fire		1		1	
Epichlorondydrin/resin formulations with bisphenol A		1		1	
Epoxy resin		1		1	
Hazardous waste	2		1	3	
Hazardous waste samples	1			1	
Isocyanates (including TDI, MDI, polyisocyanate liquid, and urethanes)		2	5	7	
Mixed chemicals		1		1	
Mixed waste	3			3	
Multiple			1	1	
Radiation	1			1	
Radioactive waste	1			1	
Tars, sealants, caulking, insulation materials (46)				6	
Asphalt (including fumes)	2	3		5	
Cable encapsulant	1			1	
Animals and animal products (51)				2	
Bird droppings/bird bodies		1		1	
Head lice	1			1	

Table B-1. Hazards Identified by Survey Respondents				
	Numbe	r of Mentior	ns as:	
OIICS Source/Hazard	Hazard Rank #1	Hazard Rank #2	Hazard Rank #3	Total
Infectious and parasitic agents (53)				14
AIDS		1		1
Airborne pathogens	1	1		2
Bacteria	1			1
Blood products		1		1
Bloodborne pathogens	2	1		3
Hepatitis B		1		1
Molds	2	3		5
Nonmetallic minerals, except fuel (55)				18
Asbestos	3	1		4
Refractory ceramic fibers	1			1
Silica (including abrasive blasting, silica dusts, and fibrous siliceous dusts)	8	3	1	12
Vermiculite		1		1
Person - other than injured or ill worker (57)				5
Bodily fluids	4	1		5
Apparel and textiles (92)				1
Latex			1	1
Atmospheric and environmental conditions (93)				1
Smoke	1			1
Scrap, waste, debris (95)				4
Dust	1			1
Roofing dust			1	1
Sewage	1			1
Wood dust		1		1